



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

FROM
THE BUSINESS
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY INC



THE GIFT OF
The Heirs of
George C. Dempsey

92.866.359



This material is fragile.

PLEASE DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

A microform of this book is available

CALL NO. Film A 591.375

Conservation by the

BARON AND CLARA GREENHUT RABINOWITZ FUND

Digitized by Google

ALCOHOLIC MEDICATION.

Temperance

By R. T. TRALL, M. D.,
AUTHOR OF "THE TRUE TEMPERANCE PLATFORM ;" "THE
ALCOHOLIC CONTROVERSY," ETC. ETC.

NEW YORK :
MILLER, WOOD & CO., PUBLISHERS,
No. 15 LAIGHT STREET.

LONDON : W. TWEEDIE, 337 STRAND.

1866.

THE HERALD OF HEALTH

AND

JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL CULTURE.

THE undersigned wish to call public attention to the above publication with the hope of extending its circulation. The following are its objects :

1. To teach the *Laws of Life and Rules of Health.*
2. The Care of Children, so as to secure to them, as far as possible, fine, vigorous constitutions and freedom from sickness.
3. School Room Hygiene, including the Health of both Pupils and Teacher.
4. The Cure of Disease by Hygienic remedies, as air, exercise, light, food, clothing, sleep, bathing, recreation, instead of by drug poison and quack medicines.
5. Physical Culture.
6. The Care of the Skin, Lungs, Eyes, Muscles, Stomach, Heart, and every vital organ upon whose good health life and happiness so much depends.

One of the great wants of the present age is health, a sound mind in a sound body. Without it, our national future, the future of families, of races, becomes more a matter of chance than a certainty. Physical degeneracy has blotted out many names from the face of the earth, that ought to have been perpetuated to bless and to take a part in the civilization and progress of the world. Many a parent has brought into the world feeble children, because the laws of life and growth were not understood. Many more have consigned their loved ones to an early grave, or had them afflicted with disease, feebleness and deformity, through a want of a knowledge of the natural laws of the body.

WHAT THEY SAY OF THE HERALD :

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMON SCHOOLS,
HARRISBURG, Pa., December 9, 1865. }

"To teacher and pupils it is particularly valuable, as much space is given to *School Room Hygiene*. It should be in the hands of every teacher in the land.

"Very truly yours,

"SAMUEL P. BATES, *Deputy Superintendent.*"

"I am much pleased with *The Herald of Health.*"—*Dr. George B. Windship, the Strong Man.*

"Full to the brim of pure crystal water! What a glorious work it is trying to accomplish, laboring to convince man that his wants are few and simple, and that health depends upon temperance and regularity; that drugs are poisons, and in pure water and fresh air are the antidotes for all our ills. Such works are sure to receive a rich reward if persevered in to the end."—*Gardener's Monthly, Philadelphia.*

"It is the best Temperance document in the country."—*Salem Independent.*

"It is a work that abounds in healthful suggestions."—*United Presbyterian.*

"An excellent monthly for every family in the land."—*Gospel Herald.*

"It is an excellent work."—*Pubs. Scientific American.*

TERMS.—\$1 50 a year; 4 copies, \$5; 10 copies, \$10. Single copies, 15 cents.

Address the Publishers,

MILLER, WOOD & Co.,

NO. 15 LAIGHT STREET, NEW YORK.

ALCOHOLIC MEDICATION.

BY R. T. TRALL, M. D.,

AUTHOR OF "THE TRUE TEMPERANCE PLATFORM;" "THE
ALCOHOLIC CONTROVERSY," ETC. ETC.

NEW YORK:

MILLER, WOOD & CO., PUBLISHERS,

NO. 15 LAIGHT STREET.

LONDON: W. TWEEDIE, 337 STRAND.

1866.

Soc 4492.866.359

✓ HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE HEIRS OF
GEORGE C. DEMPSEY

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1865, by

MILLER, WOOD & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern
District of New York.

D. H. PRIME, PRINTER, HYGIENIC INSTITUTE, NEW YORK.

THIS
Gift of
The Heirs of
George C. Dempsey

P R E F A C E .

At the request of some of the prominent friends of the Temperance cause, the following paper was prepared with the intention of submitting it, or an abstract of it, to the National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga Springs, August 1, 1865. It was intended to cover the whole ground of the scientific argument concerning Alcoholic Medication, and to meet certain criticisms and objections advanced by the London *Temperance Spectator* and other European authors and publications with regard to the doctrines presented in "The True Temperance Platform," and to elucidate more plainly the premises on which those doctrines are based, for the special benefit of those readers who have not time or disposition to study the subject in the light of first principles. But as Dr. CHARLES JEWETT had been officially invited to prepare a paper on "The Medical Question," the discussion on the employment of alcohol as a medicine came up on the presentation of his paper; hence the paper the author had prepared was not introduced; nor was his challenge to controvert the positions assumed by Dr. JEWETT, and his offer to disprove those advocated by Professor A. B. PALMER, M. D., of Michigan (who represented the medical profession in the

PREFACE.

Convention), accepted by either of those gentlemen. The author has, therefore, yielded to the suggestions of many who were present, and who with him regretted that a fair and full discussion of the whole subject could not then and there be had, to allow the manuscript to be printed in pamphlet form, and circulated as another and a needed "permanent Temperance document."

R. T. T.

ALCOHOLIC MEDICATION.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FRIENDS OF TEMPERANCE:

WHEN I assure you that I have come more than twelve hundred miles—all the way from Minnesota—and at great personal and business inconvenience, on purpose to attend this Convention, and with no motive or object except to listen to, and, perhaps, take part in, a discussion on the subject of Alcoholic Medication, you may believe that I attach much importance to the subject, and that I am quite in earnest with regard to it. I do, indeed, regard this question as *the vital issue*. And had the inconveniences and expense been many times greater, I could hardly have resisted the invitation to be here.

Veterans in the Temperance army have lately said that this is the only *unsettled question* among us. And if this National Temperance Convention shall be so fortunate as to fully discuss and finally settle this question, its action will mark a new and a glorious era. It will do *the one thing needful* for the cause.

I am satisfied that the "Communion Wine Question" will soon settle itself, after the "previous question" of Alcoholic Medication has been disposed of; for, the scientific data, and the reasoning, that are applicable to the use of alcohol as a medicine, will equally apply to the use of alcoholic liquor as a sacrament. Both questions involve the same facts, the same principles, the same arguments and the same conclusions.

The medical friends of Temperance are divided into three classes:

1. Those who regard alcoholic medicine as indispensable, and who declare that there are no adequate substitutes.
2. Those who claim that it is *per se* a good medicine, but who admit that it *may* be dispensed with *provided* we have other substitutes which will occasion similar effects.

3. Those who believe that it is *not useful* as a medicine.

This last proposition ignores entirely the question of substitutes, and meets the issue on its naked merits.

Before we can intelligently conclude whether alcohol is or is not useful, proper or necessary, as a medicine—whether it is, in any proper sense, a remedial agent at all—we must understand *the rationale of its effects*. We must be able to explain *why* it produces certain symptoms and *how* it occasions those changes, disturbances, manifestations, or phenomena, for the production of which it is prescribed, and which the advocates for Alcoholic Medication claim to be remedies, or at least medicinal.

I shall undertake to show that *every effect* of alcohol, whether it is taken as a beverage or as a medicine, is a *symptom of disease*; that agents whose effects are always and invariably *morbific*—disease-producing—can not, by any possibility, in any sense, nor under any circumstances, be supporters of vitality; and that the medical profession has mistaken a commotion in the living organism, which actually *wastes* the vital powers, for an action or impression which *sustains* them; and further, that the medical profession has always interpreted its experiences on this subject by erroneous standards.

Our discussion, therefore, involves, as essential premises:

1. The Essential Nature of Disease.
2. The *Modus Operandi* of Medicines.
3. The Relations of Remedies to Diseases.
4. The Relations of Remedies to the Normal Structures and Functions.

And underlying all, as the primary premise,

5. The Relations of Living and Dead Matter.

Without a solution of each and all of these problems, I can not see that we have any tenable ground for any argument whatever on the subject of Alcoholic Medication.

I have long been of the opinion that the real *root* of this Bohon Upas of Intemperance—against which the friends of humanity have warred so long, so faithfully, yet so unavailingly, is Alcoholic Medication; that alcohol in the drug shop is the parental source of alcohol in the dram

shop; and that so long as alcohol is prescribed as a medicine by physicians, so long it will be drank as a beverage by the people.

And why should it not be? For my life, I can see no reason against its use as a beverage that will not apply, and with stronger emphasis, against its use as a medicine; or, conversely, I am not aware of any fact or argument, that has been or that can be urged in favor of its use as a medicine, which can not be urged with equal, and even with greater stress, in favor of its employment as a beverage.

It may indeed be said that the well person does not *need* it. But this is begging the question. If it is not *useful* to the sick person, then the sick person does not need it. And if I prove that it is *absolutely injurious* to the sick, then it will be a fair presumption that the well person can *endure* it with less danger to life than the sick person can. But I will not anticipate.

I will go one step further; for I wish to give the advocates for Alcoholic Medication a fair chance to make out their case if they can. I believe that I can, now and here, give more, and stronger, and better reasons for the employment of alcohol as a beverage *for the laboring man*, than any physician, or any person, here or elsewhere, can give for its employment as a medicine for the sick man. At all events I am willing to try, if any one accepts this challenge.

Do not be alarmed, friends, if, in the exposition of the principles involved in this discussion, I am obliged to controvert doctrines and opinions which the medical profession has long entertained; and advance doctrines which are more or less subversive of the fundamental dogmas of its so-called Medical Science, as well as revolutionary with respect to many of the rules of its "Healing Art." Nature is my text-book, and if her teachings do not agree with the text-books of the Medical Schools the fault is not mine.

Wonderful changes of opinion are taking place in the world in these revolutionary times. Never before, since "the morning stars first sang together," were statesmen and philosophers so energetically pushing their investigations to first principles—to the very laws of Nature—for an enduring basis for conduct, and institutions, and systems. In Europe those illustrious physicists—GROVE, MAYER, TYNDALL, FARADAY and

HELMHOLTZ—have made more progress in this direction, during the last quarter of a century, than has been made before in all the ages.

And in our own country, opinions and politics of social relations and of government, which were hardly tolerated as matters for free discussion four years ago, are now not only the law of the land, but almost universal public sentiment.

And I think it is time that we look a little into the popular medical system, so far at least as it seems to be a stumbling block in the way of our reform, and see if some change, some revolution perhaps, is not "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

It is high time that we understood—that every man, woman and child should understand—whether it is in accordance with the purpose of the Creator, and in the order of Nature, that these bodies of ours—these temples of the living God—shall be drugged with intoxicating poison in their sickness; whether they shall swallow the drunkard's drink in their infirmities; or whether this alcoholic practice is not a huge mistake and a horrid blunder, originating in, and perpetuated by, the false doctrines of the medical profession.

It was said, in the International Temperance Convention in London, in 1862, that "the last stronghold of Intemperance would be the medical profession."

Is it not most strange and unnatural that the medical profession, with its accumulated lore of three thousand years, should be our chiefest obstacle, and, practically, the rumseller's most efficient ally?

I propose that we, here and now, in National Convention assembled, proceed at once to the storming of this stronghold of the enemy; and let the Temperance army march on to victory, either *through* the medical profession or *over* it.

Let us "fight it out on this line," if it takes all the rest of the summer. And to fight our enemy on this line is to win.

Strike home here; assault King Alcohol in the *Materia Medica*; flank him in the Pharmacy, and pursue him in the Therapeutics, and very soon he will be in as disastrous a predicament as was, not long since, a distinguished Ex-President of an ex-confederacy skedaddling in crinoline.

But we are told that alcohol, though a bad poison for the well, is a

good medicine for the sick. And we are referred to its associate drugs of the apothecary shop—opium, arsenic, henbane, prussic acid, quinine, etc.—which are also poisons, and yet are supposed to be employed beneficially, as illustrations of the assumed fact that alcohol is medicinal or remedial.

I do not accept this “change of base.” In this discussion we have nothing to do with opium, arsenic, henbane, prussic acid, nor quinine, nor even tobacco, although we may legitimately refer to them as affording data for argument, and as illustrating principles in Physiology, Pathology or Therapeutics.

I propose now to discuss alcohol. The other drugs, medicines, or poisons, must stand or fall on their own merits or demerits. And so of alcohol. When we have finished the “alcoholic muddle,” I shall have no objection, indeed I shall be more than willing, to discuss the associates of alcohol in the popular *Materia Medica*.

But, let us not now be diverted from the main question by any collateral issues. Alcohol is good or bad in and of itself. Moreover, alcohol is put forward as a medicine, on one ground that is not claimed for any other article in the *Materia Medica*, viz., *a supporter of vitality*. If this claim is just, if this doctrine be true, then alcohol ought to continue in the front rank, and at the very head of the *Materia Medica*. But if, on the contrary, it is not true, then its place in the *Materia Medica* ought to be a good way below the foot.

Physiologists admit that alcohol is inimical to every thing that has life; that no living thing, in its normal state, does or can tolerate its presence unharmed; that its contact enfeebles, blights and withers every living structure of the vegetable kingdom, and devitalizes every seed, bud, blossom, leaf, rootlet and fibre of every plant; that its application irritates, inflames and destroys every organ and every tissue of every one of the lower animals; and that its presence paralyzes, disorganizes, intoxicates, diseases, and maddens every vital instinct and every mental power of human beings.

Experiments innumerable have been tried on plants, on animals, and on man, with the uniform and invariable results of disease, delirium, debility or death, according to the quantity of the poison.

But still, in the face of these admitted facts, it is thought to be a good remedy; a "refreshment" for the weary; a "restorative" for the feeble; yea, a "supporter of vitality" for the sick! Is there not some mistake somewhere? Can that reasoning which so confounds our judgment, so confuses Nature, so stultifies our common sense, and so contradicts itself, be true science? Can that be the true Healing Art which destroys to save, which kills to cure?

I do not now discuss the question which these remarks may, perhaps, suggest, "whether *any poisons* are, in a proper sense, remedies for diseases and infirmities?" I do not now propose to argue the principle involved in the question, "Why should a person be poisoned because he is sick?" My subject is *Alcoholic Medication*, and that alone.

Not only is alcohol regarded as a good *restorative* medicine, but it stands to-day at the very head of the *Materia Medica* of the popular medical system; it is extensively prescribed by the majority of *Temperance* physicians, while the great body of the medical profession claim that it is indispensably necessary. In a multitude of conditions of ill-health, we are told, nothing is equal to it in *curative* efficacy. It can not be dispensed with without *endangering* the patient's life.

It is said to possess *nervine, narcotic and stimulant* properties, though it is chiefly administered with reference to its *stimulating effect*. But we have, in the *Materia Medica*, a hundred nervines, a hundred narcotics, and a hundred stimulants. And we have, also, many agents, each of which is supposed to possess in itself all of these properties. Yet none of them singly, nor all of them combined, occasion intoxication in the precise manner that alcohol does. It is true that tobacco and opium do occasion effects more nearly resembling those of alcohol than any other articles we are acquainted with. This is why opium is its right-hand ally as a medicine; and this is the reason why tobacco is so frequently resorted to, when alcohol is discontinued as a beverage.

Let me here, in few words, solve the mystery of these *nervine, narcotic and stimulant* "properties." The mistake of the medical profession consists in *mislocating* these properties. They do not exist in the alcohol, but in the living organism.

When a small quantity of any kind of alcoholic liquor is taken, it is

expelled by a general and nearly uniform and equal determination to all of the outlets of the body. This occasions a gentle commotion of the nervous forces, and does not unbalance the circulation. The patient experiences a feeling of exhilaration, as often happens in the forming stage of many diseases. The commotion of the organism, which is rather a pleasurable sensation of all the bodily and mental powers, is frequently the promontion of some of the most fatal diseases—yellow fever, cholera, hemorrhages, for examples.

This is the *nervine* effect; an effect depending, not on any specific property of the alcohol, but on the manner in which the system expels it.

When a larger quantity is taken, it is expelled mainly by a determination to the surface. This is *stimulation*. It is analogous to the hot stage of fever. *It is fever*. The "stimulus," therefore, does not depend on any peculiar property of the liquor, but on the manner in which the system undertakes to get rid of it.

Then, as to its narcotic property or effect. This is occasioned by very large doses. Then, the quantity being immediately dangerous to life, the vital powers resist it by a powerful determination to the first passages. This rush of blood and nerve power to the centre to meet the enemy so unbalances the circulation as to stupefy the patient, rendering him comatose or apoplectic.

Now, whether the patient is *exhilarated*, *stimulated* or *narcotized*, is a mere question of quantity. And as all the action is on the part of the living system, what becomes of these time-honored puzzles of the learned about the "action" of alcohol; its "*modus operandi*;" its "special affinities," etc.?

They have no existence except in our medical text books and in the imaginations of medical men.

At the International Temperance Convention in London, three years ago, I heard several papers read by medical gentlemen on the *effects* of alcohol; but no one pretended to understand its *modus operandi*.

And a few days after, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the British Scientific Association, I heard half a score of medical men—some of whom were also Fellows of the Royal Society—advocate the use

of alcoholic liquors as wholesome, and defend tobacco using as hygienic, while no person with M. D. to his name spoke against either.

Is it not passing strange that the medical profession can not find, or does not find, in these three hundred agents, or in some combination or preparation of them, something that will be satisfactory to them as a substitute for alcohol? Can nothing be relied on to support vitality except that which intoxicates? Are vitality and sobriety incompatibles? Perhaps this "mystery of mysteries" will become less mysterious as we proceed—if your patience holds out.

Mind you, I am not seeking substitutes. I am only wondering that the advocates for alcoholic medication can not find them, seeing that their resources are so ample. I do not want any substitute. I condemn alcoholic medicine as evil *per se*. I denounce alcohol, in its relation to the vital domain, just as we all condemn lying, cheating or stealing in its relation to our moral nature. Lying, cheating and stealing are bad in themselves. We do not want any substitutes when we abandon them. We simply wish to get rid of them; and that just means, *let them alone!*

Alcohol is not good, bad, or indifferent by comparison, although it may be better or worse. It is not good because something else is worse; nor bad because something else is better. I condemn alcohol as a medicine, because alcohol is *bad* as a medicine, and with no regard to the good or bad properties, or qualities, or effects, of other things.

I propose to look these issues full in the face. If the medical profession is right, then the Temperance cause is certainly wrong. The people believe the doctors, and teetotalism goes down. I propose to show *how* it is that the medical profession is deluded and the people misled; and how the Temperance cause is crushed to earth by the false doctrines of medical books and schools.

I raised this question, "Is alcohol useful as a medicine *per se*?" in the International Temperance Convention in London. I went there on purpose to introduce it, where, I had reason to suppose, there would be persons both willing to meet it and competent to discuss it; and where its discussion could hardly fail to attract attention.

I did not succeed in eliciting a discussion there. The subject was

ignored by a kind of common consent, and as unceremoniously as a suspected lunatic might, with propriety, be rejected from good society.

In my work, since published, "The True Temperance Platform," I have stated that, although my sentiments were applauded by the people, they were very coolly disregarded and evidently disliked by most of the medical gentlemen present. To this the *London Temperance Spectator* replies: "Were not these medical gentlemen the most competent judges of a novel physiological hypothesis?" As though the party accused, and on trial, should be both judge and jury!

But I have the satisfaction to know that what I did say there, and have since published, has led to a lively discussion in that country and in this; and although my opponents prefer to deal in epithets more than in arguments, and discuss personalities rather than principles, the public mind is being agitated beneficially and educated in the right direction.

The question whether alcohol is or is not useful as a medicine, must be determined by the solution of another and the primary problem—its *modus operandi*. How does alcohol act? What is the rationale of its effects?

We may write, talk, preach, pray, sing and argue for ever; we may collect all the discordant data of medical books and journals, and sum up the conflicting opinions of physiologists and chemists; we may collate the contradictory experiences of medical men of all nations and in all ages; we may read, and ponder over, and marvel at, the discrepancies of medical authors as to the particular diseases in which alcohol is useful or injurious; we may gather the statistics from the prisons, and penitentiaries, and pauper houses, and Lunatic asylums, and mad-houses of all the earth; we may count the grogshops and reckon the drunkards, and estimate the moderate drinkers, and enumerate the vagrant, the dissolute, the profligate, the homeless, the friendless, the heart-broken everywhere; and we may publish the horrid details of vice, and crime, and degradation, and misery, and death, in books and in newspapers and tracts; all this and much more we may do, without making the least approximation to a solution of the great primary problem which underlies our discussion, and without advancing the Temperance Reformation an infinitesimal degree.

The question is purely a scientific one. It is not to be decided by opinions, nor statistics, nor experiences, nor by all together. We have had enough of these. Our daily papers have more evidences of the effects of alcohol—assaults, shootings, stabbing affrays, wife murders, etc.—than any of us have time to read.

Our question is one of physiology. It is to be determined by *vital laws*. The laws of God and nature, as manifested in and through the living organism, are the proper basis, the only basis of our argument. If our discussion is not predicated on this basis, it will surely be in vain. If we argue this question on the basis of the relations of the vital organs to alcohol, we can hardly fail to see the truth in letters of living light. We shall not fail to reach a just conclusion.

The medical profession confesses that it can not explain the *modus operandi* of alcohol. It can give no rationale of its effects. It can not tell how, why, nor wherefore it cures disease supports vitality, or conduces to health. And why should it understand why or how alcohol is a remedy for disease, when it can not explain, *what disease itself is*? Even that is confessedly a mystery. And how can the medical profession know whether any thing is a proper remedy for any disease, unless it understands the essential nature of the disease to be medicated, and the *modus operandi* of the remedy to be employed, and thereby be acquainted with the relation of the remedy to the disease?

But these are just the problems of which the medical profession confesses that it knows nothing at all. It regards them as profound mysteries. But I charge that, on each and all of these primary and fundamental problems, the profession is not only ignorant, but in error. It teaches *false doctrines*. And this is just why it practises alcoholic medication. When we establish the true theory of disease we shall have the right practice. The medical profession *confesses* its utter inability to solve the problem of the *modus operandi* of alcohol, or that of the essential nature of disease, yet insists that alcohol is in *some way* a remedy for disease, and that it does *some how* support vitality.

We who take the negative; we who repudiate alcoholic medication, as not only useless in every case, but pernicious always, *profess* to understand the problem of its *modus operandi*. We *can* explain the rationale

of its effects. And in that explanation we find the reasons why we should not use it, either as food, drink or medicine. And I do not believe there is a physician on the earth who would publicly advocate (whatever he might do privately) the employment of alcohol as a medicine, if he understood its *modus operandi*. This problem, then, is an important, a vital one. And as we stand in relation to it and to the medical profession, it may be stated, in legal formulary :

PROFESSED KNOWLEDGE

vs.

CONFESSED IGNORANCE.

Who are, *a priori* and presumptively, most entitled to confidence; those who profess to know *all* about, or those who confess to know *nothing* about a given subject?

It is true, that in journals, and in newspapers and books, I have often explained my theory of the *modus operandi* of alcohol. But, the medical profession will neither accept my explanation, nor undertake to refute it. And in most of the controversies I have had with the doctors, they have discussed *me* much more than they have the question.

It is so with the *London Temperance Spectator*. The *Spectator* has, during the last year, devoted a large portion of its space to a defense of alcoholic medication against what it is pleased to call "Dr. TRALL's absurd verbal theory;" and, although it published many pages of notices, criticisms and reviews of my "Platform" and my positions, it has not in a single instance discussed the real question in issue. It has, however, complimented me with having "exaggerated a shallow theory into a perfect monomania."

Let there be no dodging here. Let us avoid all personalities as unbecoming this occasion. We ask medical gentlemen here to meet the real issue to discuss the *principle*, the science, the philosophy of alcoholic medication. We, on the negative, are prepared to lay all pride and prejudice, all personal ambition, all self-seeking aside, and to endeavor to rise to the height of this great argument in the spirit of brotherhood and truth seeking, as becomes reformers and philanthropists.

I ask that medical gentlemen who differ with us meet us in this spirit,

and that they bring forward their best champions, that error be exposed, the truth, whatever that may be, established, in the assurance that

"The world will be the better for it."

The *Temperance Spectator* fears that my "theory" will have a "pernicious influence on our cause." Indeed! How pernicious? My theory of the *modus operandi* of alcohol teaches *total* abstinence from it as food, drink, or medicine. It casts it out of the dram-shop; it excludes it from the grocery; it expels it from the hotel; it turns it out of the drug-shop. It limits its existence to the mechanical arts and the chemical laboratory. How in the name of Nature can this injure the Temperance cause? Why, the *Spectator* fears that if we take such *extreme* ground, the medical profession will be against us! I should like to know when it was otherwise? And I should like to be informed of any truth that is not extreme, ultra, radical, uncompromising—the exact opposite of the contrary, which is error.

How can it be pernicious to Temperance to "taste not, touch not handle not" the alcoholic bane, neither as beverage *nor* medicine? It might be pernicious to the vocation of rumsellers; and possibly somewhat damaging to the business of doctors. It would surely be fatal to moderate drinkers, so far as their drinking is concerned. And it *would* be the ruin of nine-tenths of all the distilleries in the land, and of every swill-milk manufactory on earth. It would seriously affect the trade of the apothecary, the patent-medicine vender, and the undertaker. It would utterly destroy half a score of vocations which have attained flourishing dimensions—pugilism, prostitution, gambling, etc.; and it would immensely diminish the trade of watchmen, constables, jailors, sheriffs and hangmen. But how it can prove pernicious to Temperance puzzles me exceedingly to comprehend.

Suppose all the world should accept my theory and practise it? Would every body get drunk? or would nobody get drunk? It seems to me that from that moment intemperance would cease to exist. And suppose the medical profession should not like it? What can it do? Deprived of its alcoholic missile, its objections or protests would be like an "encyclical" against the comet.

Alcohol is administered as a medicine on the theory that it *acts*, in some way, on the living organism. It is said to *act as a stimulant*. But those who tell us that it *acts as a stimulant*, forget to tell us *how a stimulant acts*! They give us meaningless phrases which only make the darkness more visible. We want to know what a stimulant is—what stimulation means.

Prof. YOUMANS, who has written a book *against* alcoholic alimentation, and who bases his argument on the ground that "alcohol has a special affinity for the brain," tells us, in his "New Chemistry," that, "In a concentrated form, alcohol is a potent poison, but when sufficiently diluted, it *acts upon the system* as a stimulant." I should like to have the Professor explain, at what point of *dilution* its "affinity for the brain" ends, and its stimulant property begins!

And let me say to the Professor, that diluting alcohol, or any other poison, does not change its nature, nor its relation to vital organs.

He might as well talk of diluting vice until it became virtue; or of diluting the Devil until he became an angel of light! He might, indeed, be less mischievous, but he would be Devil still, and devilish to the last.

Alcohol is said to act especially on the nerves; to make an *impression* on the nerves and circulating systems; and to have a "special affinity" for the brain. From the advent of LIEBIG until a very recent period, it was held that alcohol is "respiratory food" and in PEREIRA's "Food and Diet," we have the "alcoholic alimentary principle." Then it was supposed that we had discovered the long-sought rationale of its "supporting vitality." It furnished *combustible* material. It was hydro-carbonaceous *fuel*. It sustained the animal *temperature*. It was "heat-forming." It "yielded itself to oxygen" and saved the tissues. It was a substitute for "roast beef and plum pudding."

While in England I visited Nottingham and took dinner at the house of a wealthy manufacturer. Among the children of the family were two sickly-looking, pale-faced little girls, who appeared to me to be suffering for want of out-door exercise and sunshine. They were taking wine and ale, per advice of the family physician. At dinner I was offered wine. I excused myself on the ground that I was a teetotaler. The master of the house undertook to overcome my "conscientious scruples" by

assuring me that it was a "good article;" it was the "*real French wine*." He had "every confidence" in it, etc., and he persisted in urging me to "look upon the wine when it was red," until I assured him that I never used alcohol in any shape or form, as victuals, drink or medicine, and that my only business on that side of the Atlantic was to attend a Temperance Convention. Then he helped me to an extra slice of pudding, remarking, with true English hospitality, that as I did not drink wine I should need more pudding.

He was taking wine on the *alimentation* theory that it conduced in some way to respiration; and his children were taking it on the *stimulation* theory that it supported vitality. The chemist had misled the physician, and the physician was maltreating his patients. And, notwithstanding that this most absurd vagary of "respiratory food" has been sufficiently exploded, alcohol is still prescribed on the still more absurd hypothesis that *it acts in some way* to support vitality.

It acts. The *action* of alcohol is the great mystery. It was the great mystery and the great muddle of the International Temperance Convention in London. It is to-day the great error of our scientific men; the unexampled blunder of our Temperance physicians, and the unparalleled delusion of the Temperance people.

What would you think of an Anti-Tobacco physician—you know there have been Anti-Tobacco Societies, and there ought to be more of them—if he should be President of an Anti-Tobacco Society, whose members were pledged to abstain from chewing, smoking and snuffing *while in health*; but when they became sick, nervous, dyspeptic, gouty, rheumatic, consumptive, etc., he should recommend them to chew, smoke and snuff the "filthy weed" as a medicine?

Yet his position would be no more inconsistent, no more absurd, than is that of the Temperance physician who prescribes alcohol.

Such an opposition to tobacco using would not seriously damage the tobacco trade. The lovers of tobacco, like the lovers of liquor, could always find aches and pains and gripes and "goncenesses" and distresses enough to indicate the desired medicine, and physicians enough to prescribe it.

How does alcohol act? Mark you, there is no basis, nor pretended basis,

for its employment as a medicine, except the hypothesis that, in some peculiar manner, it acts on some one or more of the tissues, structures, parts or organs of the living system; and that such action maintains or supports the vital powers, under various depressing influences, and in numerous conditions of disease.

Now, the proposition that alcohol acts on the living system is either true or false. It is wholly true or wholly false. There is no compromise, like rum and sugar, no "half-and-half," like milk and whisky, about it. And thus we have, again, a direct issue—a *simple Yes or No*. And on these two little but now mighty monosyllables—*Yes, No*—I predicate my whole argument *for teetotal Temperance and against Alcoholic Medication*.

If the proposition be true that alcohol does, *in some way*, even though no one can tell how, really act on the living system, the presumption may be reasonable, that such action may possibly be useful. But, suppose that we can prove the proposition to be untrue? Where, then, will be the basis for Alcoholic Medication?

Now I deny that alcohol acts on the living system at all. I deny that alcohol has a "special affinity" for the brain, or any affinity for any living tissue. The relation is the contrary—that of antagonism.

The *modus operandi* of medicines, as assumed in medical books and taught in medical schools is, and always has been, a pernicious and most disastrous error—a fatal mistake. The popular medical doctrine just reverses the order of Nature. It has given us a false medical philosophy, and an unsuccessful Healing Art. Its first premise is wrong. Its fundamental principle is a mistake. Its basis is a physiological fallacy.

And so is the popular idea or theory of the nature of disease. On this subject, also, the medical profession teaches a false doctrine. It confounds the *causes* of disease with the disease itself; it mistakes the "*vis medicatrix nature*" for an entity at war upon it. And in attempting to subdue or counteract, or neutralize or destroy the imaginary enemy, it is really warring upon the vitality of the patient.

In the relations between living and dead matter, the dead matter does not act on the living, although this is the doctrine of medical books.

But, on the contrary, the living matter acts on the dead. This is the law of Nature.

Alcohol is no part of any living thing. It belongs to the inorganic world. It is in no sense vital, nor *vitalizing*. Its properties are chemical, not vital; and *there is no chemistry in living structures*. In its relation to living structures, alcohol is dead, inert, passive, as are all other inorganic substances. And this remark is true of all medicines and all poisons.

Tell me not that learned men, that great and good men, have always taught the contrary. That is not our question. We are not discussing what learned men *have taught*, but what Nature *does teach*. *What is truth?* This is our subject.

The medical profession will tell us, if it argues this point, that alcohol produces or occasions *certain effects*. Granted. And you may ask, "What is the difference whether alcohol *acts itself* or *superinduces an action*, so long as action in some way results? *It is all difference*. It is just the difference between life and death. The gist of our controversy lies in the *kind* of action. And the kind and quality of the action, and the good or evil of it, can only be determined by the solution of the primary question, whether the alcohol acts on the living system, or the living system on the alcohol.

The knowledge of *what* acts, and *how*, when living and dead matter come in contact, is the vital prerequisite to an understanding of the rationale of the effects of such action.

It makes *all difference*, in understanding the problems connected with the several subjects, whether external objects act on the mind or body, or the mind or body on them; whether a man eats his dinner, or his dinner eats him; whether the earth revolves around the sun, or the sun around the earth; whether the horse *draws* the cart, or the cart *pushes* the horse; in a word, whether the whale swallowed Jonah, or whether Jonah swallowed the whale!

How can we know whether the actions or the effects of alcohol are useful or injurious, unless we can understand the mode, manner, wherefore—the rationale of such actions or effects; and how can we comprehend the rationale unless we know *which* is the *acting* and which the *passive* agent?

Medical men tell us that alcohol first acts on the living system, and then the system "responds" or "reacts." I deny, totally, the doctrine of responsive action or reaction. That doctrine has slain its thousands, perhaps millions. No doctrine can be better calculated to people graveyards with untimely victims. It sent the late Prince ALBERT, in the prime of life, in the full vigor of manhood, "to that bourne from whence no traveler returns." He was "kept up" as the *London Lancet* informed us, for six days, by alcoholic stimulants, and on the seventh day his system refused any longer to respond, and he died. It was said that he died of typhoid fever. The real disease was *alcoholismus*.

If it is the living system only which acts, as I contend, when alcohol, or any other poison, or any non-usable substance, is brought in contact with its structures, then the question arises, What is the *nature of the action* ?

Those who contend that the alcohol acts, have never been able to explain the nature of *its* action ; nor have they ever explained, nor can they explain, the rationale of a single one of its acknowledged effects, on the theory that *it* acts on the living system. But, on the theory which I advocate, that it is the living system only which acts, all of its effects are intelligible and explainable. I repeat, then, the gist of the whole argument is, *the rationale of its effects*.

The living system, in its relations to external objects, and to materials within the vital domain, can act only in one of two ways. It acts to *appropriate* the substance, if it is *useful*, and to *reject* it, if it is *injurious*. If it is non-usable it is injurious ; hence all substances, in their relations to the vital organism, are resolvable into two classes—*foods and poisons*.

Foods, which are useful materials—and useful because usable in the normal processes—do not act on the living organism. Why should gin, whisky, ale or lager act on the system, any more than bread and beef, apples and potatoes act ? If you swallow a glass of brandy and water—I beg pardon ; I mean if the medical profession swallow it—why should the system act on the water, and the brandy act on the system ? Why should not both act on the system, or the system act on both ? I think the system does act on both, while neither of them act on the system at all.

Prehension, mastication, insalivation, deglutition, digestion, chymification, chilification, absorption, aeration, circulation, secretion, excretion, and assimilation, which constitute the sum of the nutritive functions, are all *vital* processes. *All are actions of the living system.*

When food is converted into tissue, no one pretends that it is the food which acts. But when a poison is expelled, we are told that *it* acts. It seems to me that the evidence that poisons can not act on the living organism is much more plain, obvious and conclusive than is the evidence that foods do not.

As food is *normally* related to the living structures, there might be at least plausibility in the idea of its action on the system; but, in the case of poisons, whose relation is *abnormal*, there is absurdity on the very face of the statement.

If you apply articles of food to any part of a living organism, externally or internally—to the stomach or to the skin—they will not act; *they will not do any thing.*

It is the same, so far as action is concerned, when poisons are taken into the living system or applied to its surface. But, in this case, the substances, instead of being digested and assimilated, are resisted and expelled.

They therefore occasion *disease*. They are the *causes* of disease. And now we are prepared to solve another mystery of the medical profession—the *nature of disease*.

Disease itself, in all of its multifarious manifestations, and complicated ramifications, and protean forms, and variable tendencies, is nothing more nor less than *vital resistance*—"remedial effort." It exists only within us and not outside of us, although the *causes* may be external. It is simply *abnormal vital action*.

It is the action of *resistance, defense, purification and reparation*, in contradistinction to that of *construction and nutrition*, which are *normal vital actions*.

Disease is, in its relation to the "*vis medicatrix naturæ*," exactly the contrary of what the medical profession teaches.

With a false doctrine of the nature of disease, and a false theory of the *modus operandi* of medicines, we need not wonder that the medical profession entertains the erroneous notion that "the strongest poisons are the best

remedies," and that alcohol, though a potent poison, is a good remedy for a majority of the diseases with which human beings are afflicted.

Call disease by what name you please—fever, inflammation, congestion, paralysis, dyspepsia, gout, rheumatism, delirium tremens, cerebro-spinal meningitis, diphtheria, Asiatic cholera, Russian epidemic, Siberian plague, or pleuro-pneumonia, it is simply *remedial effort*; and until this truth is recognized by physicians, it will never be properly nor very successfully treated.

The question now arises, if the living system acts on the alcohol to resist or expel it, how can this resistant or *repulsive* action be useful? How can it support vitality? Admitting my premise, there is no avoiding the conclusion that alcohol occasions a *waste of vitality*.

It can not be *wholesome* to be sick, though sickness may be necessary. Disease is always and unavoidably *wasteful* of vitality, as much as war is wasteful of a nation's resources. *Disease is war*—in the organic domain; and just in the ratio that it is intense or prolonged does it *expend* the vital power. The more we are exposed to the causes of disease, so as to necessitate organic war and vital expenditure, the sooner we shall exhaust the unreplaceable fund of life and the sooner we must die. The only rule of longevity is to avoid the causes of disease.

Alcohol is abnormally related to the living organism. It is a poison. It is a cause of disease, and the action of the living system which expels it is *disease*. All vital action in relation to it, however employed, wherever applied, whether *sold* by the rumrunner, or *prescribed* by the physician, is disease, and nothing else. Call it by another name; call it *stimulation*, it does not matter. *Stimulation is disease*. And how can disease support vitality.

The vital powers expend their energies in efforts to rid the system of the poison. Who does not know that the more artificial stimulus, the greater the ultimate debility?

I do not overlook the familiar fact, that when a person has had a long course of fever, or is fatigued because of a hard day's work; or is frail from constitutional inheritance; or is feeble from unphysiological habits; or is dyspeptic because of too sedentary occupation; or is *sarofulous* or consumptive for want of air, and exercise, and sunshine; or is cold, wan,

pale, torpid, and exsanguinous from any cause, a little stimulus, in the shape of "rum, brandy, gin or wine," ale, porter, punch or lager will instantly quicken the pulse, bring the color to the cheek, augment the heat of the surface, and, in many cases (where the patient has been accustomed to stimulating viands or medicines), make him feel more comfortable for a time. But this apparent improvement is delusive. The stimulant has occasioned vital war and vital waste, after which he sinks lower than before. What is the rationale?

The same effects precisely; the same excitement; the same stimulation; the same artificial or drug fever; a similar disease may be occasioned by many other poisons, as arsenic, phosphorus, capsicum, for examples. But who says arsenic is a supporter of vitality?

If a person in perfect health is slightly exposed to malaria, or takes a moderate cold, he will have a similar condition of *stimulation* or feverishness. But neither the liquor, nor the malaria, nor the cold, gives him any more strength; on the contrary, each occasions more or less waste of the inherent capital stock. Though "roused up" for a time, as he would have been by the sting of a bee, or the burning of a blistering plaster, he is only the worse for it. He would have recovered sooner, and with a larger capital of vital power, if he had been let alone. *Rest*, and not stimulus was what he needed. *Many wonderful cures are lucky escapes.*

The source of this great delusion consists in mistaking *stimulation*, which is *fever disease*, for strength.

The alcohol, whether administered as a medicine, or taken as a beverage, occasions a commotion, a disturbance. When this commotion or disturbance is moderate it is called *stimulation*; when greater in degree, *irritation*; when still greater, *fever*; and when greatest, *inflammation*.

Medical men tell us that up to a certain range or point, these effects are medicinal and support vitality; and that beyond a certain range or point they become "excessive," poisonous, toxicological, etc. But they have never been able to find the line of demarkation between the medicinal and the anti-medicinal "operation." It is as mysterious a myth as is the dividing line between moderation and *immoderation* in the use of alcohol as a beverage. No one has ever been able to tell where sobriety ends and drunkenness begins.

Now the stimulation, the fever, the disturbance, which follows the introduction of alcohol into the vital domain, is nothing more nor less than the action of the vital machinery—the *remedial struggle*, the war, *the disease*—in ridding itself of an enemy. And the waste of vital power is precisely proportioned to the degree of stimulation; in other words, to the amount of the alcoholic disease; in other words again, to the quantity of alcoholic poison.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER said, in a late sermon, that "It is not true that the degree of depression is always according to the previous excitement." For once I think the reverend gentleman was mistaken. He, too, is befogged with the fallacies of the chemico-physiologists.

Little did he dream—noble champion of Temperance as he is, and means to be—what a tremendous weapon that little sentence puts into the hands of that crafty mercantile firm—Rumseller, Devil & Co.—who are deluging the land with one hundred and fifty quack nostrums, of which alcohol is the chief ingredient.

It is this erroneous opinion on the part of the friends of Temperance, for which they are indebted to the medical profession, that the relation of alcohol and the vital organism, is reversed when the latter is sick; or that, because of sickness, the nature of alcohol is miraculously changed, which enables the dealers in the infernal trade of "dietetic gin," "plantation bitters," "dyspepsia cures," "nervous cordials," "rejuvenating elixirs," etc., to advertise their nefarious and fraudulent wares, so largely and so disgustingly through the columns of the religious and even the *Temperance* newspapers and journals.

"But," it may be objected, "if the alcohol does nothing, how can it be an enemy, and why this commotion?" or, to use the language of the *Temperance Spectator*, "If alcohol does not act, why should the living system *fret and fume*, and *irritate and foolishly excite itself*?" The answer to these objections will appear presently.

It is now clear, perhaps, that alcohol is a poison; that, as such, it is a *cause of disease*; that all of its effects are *symptoms of disease*; and that the commotion or disturbance it occasions is *disease*; and yet this disease-producer, this poison, this fiend of the still, this demon of the glass, this "enemy which steals away our brains," this thing that "biteth like

a serpent and stingeth like an adder," this grog, this "fire-water," this intoxicating liquor, this *remedy*, this *medicine*, in this enlightened nineteenth century is dosed out to men, women and children, in almost all states, stages, conditions and circumstances of diseases and disabilities "from the cradle to the grave," as though it were the veritable elixir of life, by a medical profession which has had an experience of centuries, and which prides itself on the accumulated lore of three thousand years; and that, too, as if to plume the cap of the climax of absurdity, by the advice of the *Temperance* family physicians!

I regard this doctrine—that alcohol is a supporter of vitality—as fatal to the principle of Total Abstinence. It recognizes all that the most heartless rumseller ever claimed for his "good creature of God." It grants all that the most demented toper ever dreamed in favor of "one glass more." It admits that the alcoholic bane is a vitalizing agent; and that is all that Satan himself would desire to have conceded.

We must consider, at this stage of our argument, that alcohol is never given as an eliminating agent. Many drugs which are poisonous, are claimed to have a beneficial effect because they occasion evacuations, and thereby cleanse the blood of morbid materials. But alcohol occasions no such evacuations. It can not purify as emetics, cathartics, diaphoretics, cholagogues, diuretics, etc., are supposed to do. Nor does it supply any element or material which the system can use. It does not in any manner aid or favor the processes of assimilation and disintegration, upon whose normal action and perfect balance health depends; but it retards and damages both. It does not chemically nor mechanically benefit any fluid, tissue, part or organ. It does not improve any secretion, nor correct any excretion; but, on the contrary, it attaints and depraves them all, as is evinced by the fetid breath and offensive perspiration. Its "special affinity" is said to be for the brain; yet it is passed through the system unaltered, undigested, unchanged. It is taken into the system as alcohol, and it is passed out of the system as alcohol. The only medicinal action claimed for it is "to act as a stimulant." The only remedial effect pretended for it is "to support vitality." And how does it do it?

Just as a mad dog would "support the vitality" of this audience, if peradventure, such an animal should come in suddenly among us, and

each and all of us should take to kicking him out of doors with all our might. No doubt we should be "aroused," "excited," "energized," stimulated, fevered, inflamed. And we should probably find ourselves somewhat exhausted in the operation. And I think our vitality would be *expended* rather than *supported* by the "remedial effort."

The vital powers expel alcohol from the system, through the skin, lungs and kidneys; and when they are wearied and weakened by the extraordinary and unnatural work they have had to do, the doctor gives another dose. This again arouses *expulsive* vital action; and then the vital powers are a little weaker than before; another dose is given; another vital expenditure occurs, followed by a still greater collapse, and so on to the end of the chapter; the alcohol continually "supporting the vitality," and the patient continually growing "powerfully weak," until the alcohol or the vitality is all expended.

In all such cases the final issue is only "a question of time;" whether alcohol or vitality can hold out the longest.

If the patient survive this process of poisoning and recover, despite the primary and the alcoholic disease, the physician attributes his recovery to the "restorative" effects of the alcoholic medicine; and if the patient dies, the physician thinks it is because his system is unable any longer to "respond to the action of the alcohol."

Some medical authors even say that alcohol *imparts* strength to the system, as though it could impart what it did not possess. The truth is, as is usual with medical problems, just the other way. *The system imparts strength to the alcohol.* And thousands die every year because the system imparts and expends its strength, is expelling the alcohol which has been taken as medicine.

I have asked many physicians, when they advised "toning up" their patients with a little brandy, if the *tone* was in the brandy? and if it was not, how it could "give tone" to the system? But they have all stood on their dignity and refused to answer me a word!

Can we not all see that if the medical profession has mistaken a *drain of vital power from the system* for an *impartation of vital power to the system*, it has made a very grave mistake? I fear it is a very *grave-filling* mistake!

And now let us examine the medical authorities. The testimony here is full, complete and to the point.

Says Professor ALONZO CLARK, M. D., of the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons: "All of our medicines are poisonous, and, as a consequence, every dose *diminishes* the vitality of the patient."

You notice the Professor says "*all*." He makes no exception in favor of alcohol.

Says Professor JOHN W. DRAPER, M. D., of the New York University Medical College: "Vitality once lost can never be regained."

Was there ever better logic or worse practice? All medicines are *poisons*. Alcohol is a medicine *and a poison*. All medicines, being poisons, diminish vitality. *Ergo*: Alcohol is a supporter of vitality!

"Vitality once lost can never be regained." *Ergo*: Alcohol restores vitality!

Says Professor MARTYN PAINE, M. D., of the same school, in his "Institutes of Medicine:" "The remedial operation of our medicines is essentially morbidic."

Alcohol is a medicine, and as such, its only effect is a morbid or diseased condition. *Ergo*: All medicines, including alcohol, diminish vitality. But alcohol, excluding every thing else, is a supporter of vitality!

Says Professor PAINE again: "Our remedial agents operate in the same manner as do the remote causes of disease."

The remote causes of disease are malaria, infections, contagions, and poisons and impurities of all kinds.

Medicines *operate* in the same manner as *they* do. Alcohol is a medicine. *Ergo*: "Alcohol supports vitality!"

"But how," it may be questioned, "do alcohol and other medicines *cure* disease if they are morbidic agents, and if they *operate* as do the common causes of disease?" We have the answer, full, broad, strong and eminently satisfactory.

Says Professor PAINE: "We do but cure one disease by producing another."

Alcohol produces another disease. *Ergo*: "Alcohol supports vitality."

Would any one suspect that the medical gentlemen I have quoted administer alcohol as a medicine? Well, they do!

It may occur to some of you now to ask Professors CLARK, DRAPER and PAINÉ *why* it is that, if all medicines are poisons, and all are disease-producing, and all diminish vitality, the other poisons or medicines, banes, miasms, etc., will not *support* vitality as well as alcohol? And the Professors aforesaid will answer you—*mum!*

The authorities of both the Allopathic and the Homœopathic schools recognize the principle or “law” of producing a drug disease to cure the primary malady. Hence their respective maxims or “laws of cure,” “*contraria contrariis curantur*” and “*similia similibus curantur*.”

Whether the plan of medicating diseases with big or little doses be best or worst, and whether the principle involved be true or false, right or wrong, curative or killative, is not for us to discuss at this time. It is sufficient for our argument to know that both schools are in the same muddlement in recognizing alcohol as a poison, a cause of disease, a remedy, and a “supporter of vitality.”

Let us go from the American to the English authorities; and there we find data still more ample and still more precise; for the principles we are discussing have been tested and demonstrated by direct experimentation. Let us see precisely what the facts are in relation to the effects of alcohol on vital organism. They are all summed up in PÉREIRA's *Materia Medica*.

PÉREIRA says: “Alcohol acts on plants as a rapid and fatal poison.”

That seems to dispose of the plants pretty effectually.

PÉREIRA states that numerous experiments have been performed with alcohol on birds, fishes, reptiles and mammals; leeches, frogs, turtles, minnows, sparrows, cats, dogs, horses, rabbits and guinea pigs.

And with what result? Why, all of them “gave up the ghost;” and of course, that result ought to be entirely satisfactory to the animal kingdom!

PÉREIRA tells us that, on man, “the *local* effects of alcohol are those of a powerful irritant and caustic poison;” while its *constitutional* effects are, according to dose, intoxication, drunkenness, mania, coma, apoplexy, paralysis—all tending to or terminating in death.

There is not a word, in detailing any of the experiments, that alcohol supports vitality; not a syllable that it does any thing except debilitate and

kill; not a hint that any good comes of it. All of its pretended actions are toxicological; all of its recorded effects are pathological; every effect named is a *symptom* of disease. And, moreover, PEREIRA mentions several maladies which are well known to be frequently occasioned by alcohol, among which are *coma, apoplexy, convulsions, insanity, tuberculation of the liver, scirrhus of the stomach, granular disease of the kidneys, etc.*

Do not these effects, these diseases, these experiments, exactly accord with the statements of Professors CLARK, DRAPER and PAINE? So far as the logic and the evidence are concerned, there is no conflict between the English and American authorities that alcohol *diminishes* vitality.

And now, what are we to think, when PEREIRA, in the very next paragraph, after detailing these evidences of the deadly effects—and *uniformly deadly*—of the alcoholic poison, gravely commends it to us as a good medicine in the following words:

“As a stimulant and a restorative it is given with considerable advantage in the later stage of fever. As a powerful excitant it is used to *support the vital powers.*”

Is this science? Is not this the *ne plus ultra* of absurdity? the extremity of delusion? And yet it is on just such data and reasoning that the medical profession asks us to swallow the alcoholic materia medica, and to *except* alcohol from the *teetotal* pledge!

The medical profession *proves* that alcohol is a poison and nothing else, and that all poisons *diminish* vitality; the medical profession *demonstrates* that the only relation of alcohol to vital structures is that of an enemy; the medical profession *ascertains*, by careful observation and extensive experimentation, that the effects of alcohol on plants, on animals and on man are always and invariably injurious to health and destructive to life; and then the medical profession *desires* all the world to take a drink to support vitality! There is more sound logic *against* alcoholic medication in one gibbering sot, than can be found in favor of it in all the learned lingo of books.

The *Temperance Spectator*, after “refuting” the “absurd verbal theory” which I had advanced in “The True Temperance Platform,” commends me for having “an intense hatred to alcohol in every form.” I think that is just what all Temperance men need, the great *desideratum*.

We have been taught to love it as a medicine, while we hate it as a beverage. It is like all compromises between Truth and Error—the Devil gets the whole!

I never knew how to hate alcohol until I had solved the problem of its *modus operandi*. And if the *Spectator* hates alcohol now, even "with a perfect hatred," it will hate it *more perfectly*, certainly more practically, when it understands the rationale of its effects.

The medical profession has mistaken a *symptom of disease* for a *restorative process*. It has mistaken a *remedial* for a *conservative* action. It has mistaken the *defensive struggle* for *augmented vitality*. It has mistaken a process of *waste* for one of *supply*. It has confounded *pathology* with *physiology*.

"Married immortality with death,"

and sent millions to premature graves.

True it is, that thousands of sick persons who are medicated with alcohol do not die. Some, too, have the plague, and the cholera, and the spotted fever, and the diphtheria, and recover, even with alcoholic poison superadded. But who knows, who will ever know, or ever can know, what a large proportion of those who are supposed to recover with the aid of medicine do really recover *in spite of it*?

When physicians prescribe alcohol for all of their fever patients, for example, and twenty or thirty of every hundred die, they assume that the alcohol saves, or at least benefits, all who recover. This is fallacious reasoning. We might as well charge that all who die are *killed* by the alcohol. The *experience* proves just as much one way as the other.

But, fortunately, we have had a kind of experience that *proves* in the right direction. Since the advent of the Hygienic medical system many physicians of this school, in various parts of this country, and in other countries, have treated all of the ordinary forms of fever, without using stimulants of any kind and without losing a single patient. During the last twenty years, from 1845 to 1865, I have myself treated hundreds of cases of fevers and have not yet lost the first one. And, perhaps, I may pertinently add, that during a previous practice of ten years, when I gave the usual alcoholic and other stimulants, I lost about the usual proportion of cases.

Did it never occur to you, friends of Temperance, how strange it is that of the two thousand poisons of the apothecary shop, no one, save alcohol, has ever been suspected of directly supporting vitality?

Compare this strange fact with another still stranger. No agent, drug or poison, known, has been so thoroughly proved to be *anti-vital*!

Alcohol aside, no one thinks of supporting vitality except in the natural way, by means of air, water, food and exercise, and other Hygienic agencies.

But this alcohol seems to be a marvelous creature! Like Satan in his flight through chaos in search of our first parents, it *acts* in utter contempt of the laws of the Universe. Not only does it *act* contrary to the laws of Nature, but it *acts* contrary to the laws of itself! It is a poison to plants, animals and man. It is a *devitalizer to all*; and then it "supports the vitality" of *man*! Why should it not be a "restorative" to plants and animals also? It seems to exercise a doubled-faced or contradictory nature toward man, while it maintains a single and consistent character toward animals and plants. And it seems to bring a sort of hallucination over the brains of medical men, so that they can not reason on the subject of alcohol as they reason on other subjects.

How would such testimony as we find in the standard medical works in favor of alcoholic medication be received in a Court of Justice? How would the legal profession regard it? Let us change the scene from the arena of medicine to the legal forum.

Suppose King Alcohol is to be tried for his liberty or his life.

CHARGE.—Assault and battery with intent to kill, and conspiracy against the human constitution.

Specification 1.—In that he caused JOHN DOE, on divers occasions, to stagger in the street and mutter senseless gibberish, to the disgrace of human nature and the scandal of the neighborhood.

Specification 2.—In that he caused RICHARD ROE to become stupid, comatose and apoplectic, in the public highway, in which condition he was set upon by thieves and robbed of all his money.

Specification 3.—In that he possessed one JOHN JONES of a diabolical

thirst, which caused him to sell all of his possessions and give the avails to one of his neighbors who kept a rumhole.

Specification 4.—In that he cast a spell over one THOMAS BROWN, inducing him to lie in the gutter one cold winter's night, without any clothes, whereby his nose and his toes became badly froze.

Specification 5.—In that he has influenced divers hitherto respectable men and women to become vagabonds and paupers, as will more fully appear in schedules marked A to Z.

Specification 6.—In that he instigated BRIDGET O'WHALEY to beat her child with a club, and BRIEN McSMITH to murder his wife.

The learned counsel for the prisoner do not deny the facts. They do not plead justification for these "eccentricities" of conduct. All they propose to do for their client, in the way of defense, is to show that he has done good in other ways, and that he is an indispensable member of society.

Let them call their witnesses. Come forth, Medical Profession! Put your right hand on the Bible and swear!

What is the general reputation of Alcohol?

"As a beverage it is bad, very bad; but as a medicine it is excellent, quite excellent."

How does his character stand with the Medical Profession?

"Good, very good; no one stands higher."

How has his good character, which is bad among the people, been established in the profession?

"By an extensive series of experiments, very carefully conducted and faithfully recorded, on plants, on animals and on man, with the view of ascertaining his physiological effects."

And were his physiological effects ascertained?

"Yes, very accurately, minutely and precisely."

Were there any discrepancies in the results of those experiments?

"None whatever. All agreed in every particular."

What were those experiments?

"Alcohol was applied to the different parts of a great variety of plants."

What were the results?

"He acted as a rapid and fatal poison."

What further experiments have been made?

"Alcohol has been introduced into the stomach of frogs, cats, dogs and guinea pigs; applied to the brain, spinal marrow, heart, nerves and extremities, and injected beneath the skin of divers cats and dogs, and frogs innumerable. Leeches have been immersed in him. He has been administered to the stomachs of turtles; injected into their bowels; inserted into their skins; injected into the jugular veins of horses and dogs, and applied in various ways to birds and fishes."

What did Alcohol do to the animals?

"They all died."

Any thing further?

"Yes. He has been tried on man for several thousands of years."

What did he do to man?

"His effects were those of 'a powerful irritant and caustic poison.'"

But what special acts did he perform on man, on which you predicate your opinion of his good character as a medicine?

"He *excited* and *inflamed* him; *burnt his throat*; made him *thirsty*; gave him a *pain in the stomach*, with a *flushed face*; produced *feverishness*, a *furred tongue*, and an *offensive breath*; induced a *disposition to stagger* and a *propensity to fight*, when the doses were small and frequently repeated. But when he was given in larger doses, he made the patient *intoxicated*, *delirious*, *insane*, *mad*, *furious*, *fiendish*, *comatose* and *apoplectic*."

How do you distinguish between his medical and his poisonous actions?

"Poisonous actions are those which immediately endanger the patient's life. Medicinal actions are those which do not."

Then the poisonous and the medicinal effects are the same, only differing in degree?

"Precisely that—though not exactly so."

How? Why? What do you mean?

"Poisonous effects are those which occur when he is drank by a person in a state of health. Medicinal effects are those which occur when he is administered to a person in a condition of disease or disability."

But, are not the effects the same in both cases?

"Yes. No. Perhaps so. Probably not."

Your answer is not quite clear. Please state to the Court and jury whether the *symptoms of the poisons*, and the *effects of the medicine* are the same, only differing in degree according to dose?

"I prefer not to answer that question."

On the ground that it would criminate yourself?

"I claim the protection of the Court." -

Will you state how it was in the cases experimented on?

"Small doses occasioned *heat, pain, thirst, excitement, fever*, and large doses occasioned *delirium, coma, convulsions* and *death*."

Then where is the line of demarkation between his medicinal and his poisonous effects?

"There is none. The nature of his action depends on the condition of the patient."

What would you call the effects of moderate drinking?

"Poisonous, of course. All drinking is poisoning."

But, if the symptoms or effects are the same, when he is administered as a medicine, would they not be poisonous?

"Perhaps so. But that does not derogate from his value as a medicine?"

How? Explain.

"He cures one disease by producing another."

How, then, can he support vitality?

This question the witness refuses to answer, and is committed for contempt.

Is not this a beautiful justification? Yet the medical profession gives us no better.

And now what is this medical profession doing for Temperance, that we must accept its opinions unquestioned and defer to its judgment or its dictum, instead of exercising our own minds on the subject? Is it foremost in our cause? Is it a leader in the Temperance army? Is it even our ally? Does its societies, its meetings, its public demonstrations ever discuss, ever entertain or even mention the Temperance Reformation? Did you ever hear or read of a project, or even a resolution, in favor of some measure to promote the Temperance cause, emanating from that source?

For fifteen years there has been an "American Medical Association." It is represented by the *elite* of the profession of the United States. It holds meetings annually to discuss matters which pertain to its honor and dignity, and to the conservation of the health of the dear people. Its last meeting was held in Boston a few weeks since. One of its annual meetings was held at St. Louis, Mo., a few years ago. On that occasion it passed some great resolutions and eat a great dinner; and on that table, among the viands, were *forty kinds of alcoholic liquor!*

A friend of *medical* Temperance sent me the printed bill of fare, which I published at the time.

And this American Medical Association, then and there, deliberately adopted a resolution confessing and affirming that its whole system is a false one—in its own language, "*erroneous in theory and fatal in practice.*"

And are we to take the mere opinions or worse experiences of this medical profession as our rule of faith and guide in practice in conducting the Temperance Reformation?

No, no. This medical profession has had its heel on the neck of the Temperance cause too long already. Take it out of the keeping of the medical profession; sever all connection and all relation; recognize the profession as your mighty antagonist; as your chiefest foe, instead of your best ally, and I will answer with my life—I would answer with a thousand lives, if I had them—for the success of our cause.

Why, what is there in the way of our success? Only one thing—Alcoholic Medication. Every other obstacle has been removed; all other difficulties have been overcome. What hinders us in our efforts to do away with alcoholic medication? The medical profession, that is all. Well, then, I move you, Mr. President, that we remove the medical profession, and then go on and finish our work.

I had the opportunity to say, in Exeter Hall, London, on the occasion of the public demonstration of the International Temperance Convention, before an audience of five thousand persons, that, when the Temperance army would inscribe on its banners just three words—**NO ALCOHOLIC MEDICATION**—its onward march to victory would be sure and speedy.

On that occasion, too, I uttered a prophecy which has since become

history. And as I am just now somewhat anxious for the reputation of a *true* prophet, I will tell you how it happened.

I was comparing our Union war against Rebellom with the Temperance war against alcohol; and I remarked that our Northern people on the other side of the Atlantic were trying the experiment of conducting a war on peace principles, and that the experiment did not seem to be working well; but, if our President would emblazon on the dome of our Nation's Capitol, three magic words—LIBERTY FOR ALL—the war for the Union would achieve itself; then, "God would be on the side of the heaviest artillery." We should have no more Bull Runs, nor runs from Richmond. Our mistake consists in trying so to conduct the war as not to damage the *cause* of the war. *The cause is Slavery.* When we strike at that the work will soon be done.

But Slavery was no more the root of that gigantic rebellion, than Alcoholic Medication is the root of this prevailing intemperance. Strike at this and your enemy dies. Why can not the Temperance leaders see it? Why can not or will not our medical men see it? Can we never learn wisdom from the terrible lessons of experience?

Why, humanity has waged incessant war against King Alcohol for four thousand years. For nearly half a century this war has been organized. Its officers, faithful, valiant, good and true, count by thousands, and its soldiers, brave and willing, by hundreds of thousands. Yet, where are we to-day? Defeated on all sides. The enemy victorious and rampant everywhere. More intoxicating liquors manufactured and drank than ever before. Why is this?

I fear that some good friends of Temperance, who occupy commanding positions, are acting the part of those well-meaning but sadly-mistaken Union Generals who sought, through two terrible years of bloody strife, to obviate an *effect* while protecting its *cause*. Of course, they did not succeed very well.

For two long years, defeat, disaster, disgrace, attended our well-appointed armies. Many deeds of daring were done. Many noble heroes were slain. The nation poured out her boundless treasures unstintedly. Her sons fought bravely on a hundred battle-fields. They gave their lives freely. Their blood ran down the mountain sides in Virginia,

•

in Tennessee, in Georgia, like the rills, and washed the valleys like the rain.

But the prospect darkened continually. Our people were becoming disheartened. Foreign nations were talking mysteriously and acting menacingly. Intestine machinations were rife. There was rioting in the great commercial city. Gold had nearly reached 300.

Then it was that the great God inspired the good heart of our noble Captain—now a saint in Heaven! The Proclamation went forth. The foes of free government everywhere trembled in their souls while they derided with their lips. NO MORE SLAVERY! was the battle-cry, shouted from the Lakes to the Gulf, and echoed from ocean to ocean. Our armies went forth "conquering and to conquer." No more defeats. No more retreats. The axe had been laid at the root of the tree of Rebellion, and it perished.

Can not this National Temperance Convention strike the axe of reform to the root of the tree of Intemperance? You have the power and the opportunity. Do this, here and now, and this occasion and your names will be immortalized in song and story. Do this, and this day will be a day of jubilee for the generations yet unborn. *Alcoholic Medication is the root.* Why delay the blow which humanity implores and God commands you to strike?

At the public meeting in Exeter Hall, to which I have alluded, I heard a venerable, white-haired clergyman make an eloquent appeal to his ministerial brethren to take united and open ground against intemperance.

Said he, "If you will, one and all, give your voices and your influence for the Temperance cause, this desolating tide of vice and crime, debauchery and ruin will be stayed."

It was true; very true. But why could not, why would not, *why do not*, Christian ministers everywhere take this stand? Why do they even wait to be prompted?

Alas! the good Bishop did not dream of "a power behind the throne, stronger than the throne itself." He was not aware that behind the clerical was the medical profession. He did not seem to be aware that, on this subject, the medical profession is well nigh omnipotent. He did

not sufficiently consider that the clergy (himself probably included), as well as the people, recognize the medical profession as the proper authority on all matters pertaining to life and health, diseases and remedies. It did not occur to him that God's ministers are powerless here; and that the only possible method for having either ministers or people in their true and permanent position in relation to the Temperance cause is, first of all, to reform the false doctrines of the medical profession. How can Christian ministers, in their visitations among the sick and dying of their flocks, declaim against poison Alcohol, and quote Scripture that "No drunkard shall enter the kingdom of Heaven," "Look not upon the wine," "They that seek strong drink have wo and sorrow," etc., while the family physician is prescribing it before their eyes, and with the authority of a Sir Oracle, as a good and necessary medicine, a restorative and a supporter of vitality?

Oh, no! Instead of blaming the Shepherd, whose hands we have tied, and whose tongue the usages of society and the accursed license laws, have silenced, *let us remove the wolf!*

Let us take the medical profession out of his way, and then, if there is any need for Temperance sermons they will be "plenty as blackberries."

Why, men wonder at the failure of the Maine Law, and marvel at the inefficacy of all prohibitory legislation; and many friends of Temperance are doubting the principle of legal suasion. Ah! how few of them are aware of the real cause of their failure! How few even dream of the real difficulty!

The doctrines of the medical profession, false though they are, are a power greater than statutes, stronger than courts and juries. And why should they not be? The people have a "higher law" right to act their honest convictions. And so long as they are indoctrinated with the principle that alcohol will sustain the vital energies, they will have it, and have a right to have it. Nor will they, nor should they, be obliged to pay a physician two dollars for prescribing it, when they can buy it of the rum-seller for ten cents a dose or one dollar a bottle.

Educate the world aright on this subject, and then your Maine Laws can be executed. And then you will have no need of Maine Laws.

The opinion is almost universally prevalent that, in many sudden emergencies of sickness and of injuries, nothing can save the patient's life but the prompt administration of alcohol in some form. And while such an opinion exists, you might as well undertake to arrest a tornado with a parasol as to stop the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

While medical men make and control public sentiment, and direct that sentiment in favor of alcoholic medicine, you will have a sufficient explanation of "reactions," as they are called, against all methods, legal or moral, for promoting the Temperance cause.

Contrast the position of the medical profession in relation to the Temperance cause, with that of the Health Reformers of our country. They too have a National Association. I have the honor to be President of that Association, and I know of no earthly distinction of which I should be prouder. It is, in my opinion, the best, the most thorough and practical, the most useful and successful Temperance organization in existence. Though many do well, this excels them all.

But it has not a dollar of funds. It never had a penny by way of contribution. It works "without money and without price." Yet it is, in my humble judgment, doing more for the Temperance cause than any other Temperance organization on the earth; and this because it is working on the right principle—the *physiological basis*.

Its members are all thoroughly educated in the philosophy of the subject. They will no more take alcohol as a medicine than they will take it as a beverage. Nature's volume is their authority, and with them it is enough to know that alcohol and the vital organism are in the relation of natural, unalterable and eternal antagonism. And being thoroughly grounded in this law of Nature—new-born and baptized in this truth—to "taste not, touch not, handle not," as food, drink or medicine, the evil thing is, with them, not a privation, but a privilege; not a "dead profession," but a "living faith."

And they do not have to change their base of operations to please or propitiate the medical profession. They are not hand-bound nor tonguetied. Nor are they in the least muddled or confused by the technical gibberish and conflicting statements of medical men and medical books. And in every one of their annual meetings they have given the Tem-

perance Reformation a prominent place among their resolutions; and have, in every Convention, proclaimed "No Alcoholic Medication" as the proper and the only base of operations for warring upon Intemperance.

Thirty years ago the Temperance people were all right. The cause was doing well. We had the "long pledge," which excluded alcohol as a medicine. But, in order to have the doctors on our side, alcoholic medication was conceded. The *short* pledge was adopted, and we have since then been battling the foe with our right arm tied behind us, and our left arm fastened to our right; so that nearly all we could do was to adopt the Chinese tactics—beat gongs, explode crackers, yell and scream, and make up frightful faces at the enemy, and—you know the result!

We have, indeed, done some good. We have reformed many drunkards. But, the rumsellers have manufactured them faster than we have reformed them. We have built asylums for inebriates when we should have demolished the grogshops. We have restored many lost and ruined men to sobriety, to family, to home and to happiness. But the doctors, by the infernal engineering of their alcoholic medication, have sent them back to their cups, to a deeper degradation and to a drunkard's grave.

The abandonment of the "long pledge" was a most disastrous error, and the sooner we rectify the mistake the better. From that day to this alcoholic medication has been steadily increasing in the land, and is now more prevalent than ever before. And although by almost superhuman efforts, from 1840 to 1855, the Temperance cause seemed to be progressing to a successful issue, yet for the last ten years it has receded faster than it ever advanced.

One terrible and appalling fact tells the whole story of the present deplorable aspect of the cause. I read in the *Chicago Tribune*, a few days ago, a statement that the quantity of alcohol, or "high wines," manufactured in the United States the last year—in addition to enormous quantities smuggled into the country from Canada—was not less than *ninety millions of gallons*. On this the Government claims a revenue of one hundred and eighty millions of dollars; but the manufacturers are said to be so shrewd and ingenious in the management of their business affairs that not a fiftieth part of the tax is collected.

This ninety millions of gallons of alcohol, when diluted and

concocted into the various kinds of intoxicating drinks and retailed at the counter, can not cost the consumers less than one thousand millions of dollars.

Why, this sum would pay our National Debt in three years; and yet it is far from being all that our nation expends for liquor. There are immense breweries all over the country, and then we import very largely.

In view of these fearful evidences of a deteriorating public sentiment, I do here and now, and with sincere conviction of its truthfulness, charge the defeat and disgrace, and present discouraging aspect of the Temperance cause, not to perverse human nature; not to faithlessness and want of zeal on the part of its friends; not to a lack of co-workers, good and true; not to a want of men or money; but, *immediately*, to alcohol medication, and, *primarily*, to the false doctrines of the medical profession in relation to the *modus operandi* of medicines.

If these doctrines are true; if alcohol is, in any sense whatever, a "supporter of vitality," then alcoholic medication is right; and then, too, the horrid vocation of the rumseller is right, and Teetotalism is, in the language of the *Westminster Review* of a few years ago, a "physiological error."

But, if these doctrines are false, they should not be allowed any longer to curse the world and ruin the Temperance cause.

There is no end to the monstrosities of theory and the falsities of practice which necessarily grow out of this delusion, that alcohol is a supporter of vitality. It is the incentive to, and the parent of, a thousand pernicious habits in society. Its evils are not limited to the business of killing folks *alcoholically*.

Why, alcohol is administered to *prevent* disease as well as to cure it. It is given to *fortify* the system *against* disease; to *sustain* the system *under* disease; to *carry* the system *through* disease, and to *restore* the system *after* disease.

It seems to be regarded by many medical men as the *vital principle itself*—or the veritable "*vis medicatrix naturæ*." And if it were the vital principle and the *vis medicatrix naturæ* combined, it could not do more for "suffering humanity" than the medical profession claims for it now.

When our brave Army of the Potomac went into that famous (or infamous) battle at a celebrated place called Bull Run, Surgeon and Professor HAMILTON (so he has himself reported in the *American Medical Times*) fed brandy freely, not only to the sick and wounded, but to the soldiers on duty, to "support" them in their struggle with the foe. You have heard, probably, how that battle terminated.

When, at a later period, that same noble, devoted, gallant, yet much-abused army, was rusticated in the Chickahominy Swamps, the soldiers were drugged with whisky and quinine, in double-extra doses, to keep off malarial fevers—as though fevers were entities like rebels, and, unlike rebels, had a mortal antipathy to whisky. And we have not forgotten the unexampled mortality of "typhoid," and the frequent *changes of base*, until the remnant of that magnificently-appointed army found itself comparatively safe behind the defences at Washington, with the rebels in—Pennsylvania!

I do not say that whisky was *especially* the cause of the "On to Richmond" movement being so disastrously retrogressed into a *back to Washington* operation. But I do believe that, during our late civil war, more of our brave boys died of drug medicines than were killed by rebel bullets."

A few days ago four assassins—Payne, Harrold, Atzerodt and Mrs. Surratt—were hung at Washington. And we are informed that three of them were stimulated with alcohol to *support* their vitality for the occasion.

Was not that blending the farcical with the tragical? Has it come to this, that the same infuriating poison which urges the murderous hand to deeds of blood, is necessary to prepare the body for execution, and the guilty soul for appearing in the visible presence of its God?

Alas! how many persons die in a state of intoxication because of alcoholic medicine! How few, indeed, are there whose spirits do not wing their flight "to mansions in the skies," in a condition of actual drunkenness, under this almost universal reign of alcoholic medication!

There was an incident, in the recent tragedy at Washington, that ought to be appreciated as a stinging rebuke to all who, in that

awful hour, put the intoxicating cup to the lips of those wretched criminals. Payne, apparently the most insensate and brutal of them all, positively refused to take the *medicine*, declaring that he would die a sober man! He was unwilling to "give up the ghost," to see "the last of earth," and pass the dark valley of the shadow of death, with his reason beclouded, his moral sense obscured, and his whole mind becrazed.

Another, and a still more monstrous application of the prevalent medical doctrine which mistakes stimulation for strength, has lately been made in high places. The correspondents of our leading newspapers wrote from Washington, not many weeks ago—and the story has been published and scattered broadcast over the land, without a syllable of editorial dissent—that Secretary SEWARD was greatly benefited in his health by the ferocious assault upon himself and his son, and by the murder of the President.

"The *loss of blood and mental shock*," it was affirmed, were "just what were needed to *rouse up* his feeble energies" and enable him to recover! Oh, this terrible mistake! this murderous—I mean *manslaughterous*—delusion, that stimulus can "energise" the vital domain beneficially!

Preposterous and life-destroying as is the principle here announced, it is precisely the same as that on which the medical profession predicates the use of alcohol as a medicine.

"Alcohol *arouses* the vital energies!" So it does, and that is just why it is objectionable. The vital energies, especially when they are feeble, had better be allowed to devote themselves wholly to the purification and replenishment of the bodily organs, to building up and taking care of the instruments of the soul, instead of being "roused up" to expend themselves in fighting an enemy.

"Alcohol *arouses* the vital energies;" so does the lash! So does a burn. So does assault and battery. So does a mental shock. So does the story of a horrid murder. So do arsenic, corrosive sublimate, the sting of a bee and the bite of a rattlesnake. But, in each case, the "aroused energy" is as surely wasted as the *aroused blood* is wasted in the process of venesection.

I am aware that the medical profession has a doctrine, now, fortu-

nately, on the wane, that taking out a portion of the blood, will in some way tend to improve the *quality* of the remainder. But, I think this error springs from the same false dogma as does the notion that *alcoholizing the vitality will increase its quantity*.

It is, however, pertinent and instructive to remark here, that the doctrine that bleeding improves the blood, or is properly a remedial process in any case, is now disputed. Some of the first authors and living teachers in the regular medical profession, in Europe and in this country, have within a few years expressed the opinion, and publicly taught, *that bleeding has always been a mistake*.

This may be true. Enough of human blood has been shed in the treatment of disease to float all the navies in the world; perhaps more than has been spilled in all the wars of the world!

And if bleeding persons because they are sick has been a great, a fatal mistake, poisoning them with alcohol has been a greater, a still more fatal blunder. I am inclined to think that if all the blood which the medical profession has spilled were collected together, it would make quite a respectable little *ocean*, or a pretty large-sized "Dead Sea." And I am not sure that, if all the alcohol which the profession is to-day prescribing as medicine could be turned into one channel, it would run a stream larger than that of all the Springs of Saratoga.

Not many centuries ago some of the learned Esculapians taught the doctrine that freshly-drawn blood of healthy, and especially of young; persons was an excellent restorative for old and feeble persons. Blood was then regarded as much a supporter of vitality as alcohol is now, and with a hundred times as much reason, for blood is a formation of living organisms, while alcohol is a product of rottenness and decay. And somehow it has always happened that blood-drinking and blood-eating, as well as blood-spilling, have gone hand in hand with alcoholic medication.

In 1438, Louis XI. of France drank the warm blood of infants (prescribed, of course, by the family physician), in the vain hope of restoring his lost vitality and eking out a miserable existence.

And in the year of our Lord 1860, Professor Wood of New York, in a clinical lecture before a class of medical students, prescribed, for a frail, scrofulous child, among other things, *brandy and blood-gravy*!

With regard to the *grog* part of the prescription, the Professor remarked, "These youngsters will soon get to love it!"

Yes, they will, *too soon*, "get to love it," and when these youngsters get to love it as a medicine, how is the doctor going to prevent them from loving it as a beverage?

Professor BARKER of the New York Medical College, stated, in the same year, 1860, in a clinical lecture, that he had known several ladies to become habitual drunkards, in consequence of the appetite formed by alcohol which was prescribed to them as medicine.

And who of us has not known reformed drunkards to become re-deformed, and die the death of the sot, because of the alcoholic medicine which the *Temperance* physician prescribed?

Two years ago, a large-framed, broad-shouldered man called in my office in New York. He was a person of capacious chest, ample stomach, powerful muscle, and immense vital resources. It was Tom Hyer, the celebrated pugilist. He was now bilious, cadaverous, plethoric, asthmatic and dropsical. Said I, "Tom, you are in a bad way. What has happened?"

"Oh, I have been running down for about a year."

"And what have you being doing about it?"

"I have had the best physicians in the city. Professor Wood among the rest."

"And what have they done for you?"

"Gave me medicines of various kinds."

"Did they say any thing to you about leaving off bad habits—liquor and tobacco—eating plain food, bathing, personal cleanliness, quiet, etc.?"

"No; not a word. But they recommended me to take *more* liquor, especially ale."

"Then you have been taking liquor as a medicine for a whole year, and running down all the time?"

"Yes."

"What do they advise you to do now?"

"To go to the Hot Springs of Arkansas."

"You have taken too much liquor-medicine, Tom. I suspect it has made a finish of you."

"I have been thinking so myself for some time. Do you think you can do any thing for me?"

"I am sorry to say that it is too late."

"Then you think I can not recover?"

"It is my duty to tell you so plainly."

"How long do you think I can live?"

"Not many weeks at furthest."

The strong, stalwart man had had a little constipation of the bowels, or torpidity of the liver, *alcoholized* into a fatal dropsy. He thanked me for my candor and frankness, and, soon after, died.

I can look back with horror, though without remorse, to the first ten years of my professional life—from 1835 to 1845. I recollect how that hale old man, that blooming young mother, that vigorous youth, and that prattling child, died so suddenly and unexpectedly to me and to their friends. They did not seem to be dangerously sick. There was nothing alarming in their symptoms. But they were weak, and I must not let them "run down." I had been taught that "low diathesis" must be stimulated.

They grew weaker, and I increased the doses. God knows I did not intend to kill them. I could not then comprehend the rationale of their death. I think I understand it now.

A few years ago I was traveling between New York and Philadelphia in company with a medical gentleman of New Jersey. He was not of my school, but God never made a more honest man.

In course of conversation he stated that, in treating the diseases of his neighborhood, he did not prescribe one-tenth as much tonic medicine as the physicians all around him did; and as to stimulants, he discarded them entirely.

Said he, "I have never been able to see the good effects of stimulants, which other physicians think they see. Nor have I ever found the benefit from them that one might expect from reading medical books."

I am now prepared to answer two very important questions, which deeply concern the welfare of the human family, and which the whole drift of my argument is calculated to suggest.

1. Why is it that physicians, in their treatment of diseases, rely so much on drug-poisons, and so little on Hygiene?

I answer, because of a false education.

2. Why do physicians prescribe alcohol as a medicine at all?

I answer, because of the false doctrines taught in their books and schools.

In conclusion, there is one thought to which I can not forbear to call attention. Who can adequately estimate the frailty, the depravity, the disorganization and infirmity of body, and the dementation and eccentricity of mind entailed on offspring, by the alcoholic medicine which is administered to their mothers before they are born, or to their fathers before they are begotten? The very germ of life is often attained in its ovarian bed; or the embryo is contaminated in its sacred womb. But, even if the child is so lucky as to be born unmarred and undeformed by alcoholic poison, it has a hundred chances to one to imbibe the poison with its mother's milk, or to have it mingled with some of the multitudinous remedies for the manifold maladies of infancy which abound in the nursery. Soothing syrups, and quieting paregorics, and infantile nervines, and carminative baby drops are always vile concoctions of alcohol and opium.

Rarely is the infant so fortunate as to emerge from cradledom uninjured by the alcoholic bane. And not only for the sake of the rising generation, but for the salvation of the generations yet unborn, do I plead for the prompt and the eternal disuse of alcohol as a medicine.

I propose, Mr. President and Friends of Temperance, that we adopt, as the sense of this National Temperance Convention, the following preamble and resolution:

Whereas, We believe alcohol to be a product of the decomposition and decay of organic matter, inimical to all vital structures under all circumstances, and in no sense "respiratory food," nor a "supporter of vitality;" therefore

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to abstain from all forms of spirituous and malt liquors, wines and cider, either as food, drink or medicine; and that we recommend all Temperance organizations, and all friends of our cause, to adopt this pledge as the proper basis for the successful prosecution of the Temperance Reformation.

LIST OF BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

MILLER, WOOD & COMPANY,

No. 15 LAIGHT STREET, NEW YORK.

NOTE.—The Publishers furnish the following of their Publications by mail for the prices annexed. They can supply orders, accompanied by the cash, for books on any subject. They solicit orders for their Publications from all who are interested in the subject of Hygiene Medication, Physical Culture, the care of the body, and, in short, whatever relates to Human Health.

THE HYDROPATHIC ENCYCLOPEDIA—ILLUSTRATED.

A Complete System of Hydropathy and Hygiene; the Anatomy and Physiology of the Human Body shown; the Nature, Cause and Treatment of all Diseases explained; application to Surgery, Midwifery and the Nursery. By Dr. TRALL. Price, \$4.50.

HANDBOOK OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE—NEW WORK.

A Handbook of Practice, containing the latest and most approved methods of treating all forms of Disease. It is condensed, complete, in a cheap form, and the author designed it to supersede all others heretofore written. By Dr. TRALL. Price, \$2.

DIPHTHERIA—ITS NATURE, HISTORY, CAUSES, PREVENTION, and Treatment on Hygienic Principles; with an Exposition of the Various Theories, Errors and Practices of the Medical Profession. By Dr. TRALL. Price, \$1.60.

THE TRUE TEMPERANCE PLATFORM.

Being an Exposition of the Fallacy of Alcoholic Medication. The only Temperance document founded on the right basis. The errors of Temperance Reformers and the Medical Profession, and the effects of alcohol upon plants, animals and man are here scientifically explained. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 60 cents.

NERVOUS DEBILITY.

The Nature, Causes, Consequences, and the Hygienic Treatment of invalids suffering of vital exhaustion. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 20 cents.

DISEASES OF THE THROAT AND LUNGS,

Consumption, Bronchitis, Throat-Ail, Quinsy, Croup, Influenza and Pneumonia, with their causes and treatment shown. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 25 cents.

WATER CURE FOR THE MILLION.

The processes of Water Cure explained; Popular Errors exposed; Hygienic and Drug Medication contrasted; with rules of Bathing, Dieting, Exercising, etc. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 35 cents.

DRUG MEDICINES.

Their Nature, Modus Operandi and Effects explained. With an exposition of the false doctrines on which their use is predicated. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 20 cents.

PATHOLOGY OF THE REPRODUCTIVE ORGANS.

A Digest of all forms of Sexual Diseases and their Cure. By Dr. TRALL. Price, \$2.

UTERINE DISEASES AND DISPLACEMENTS.

A work of practical value to every student and to all persons afflicted with uterine diseases. By Dr. TRALL. Price, plain plates, \$3.50; with colored plates, \$6.

HOME TREATMENT OF SEXUAL ABUSES.

A valuable work for home use. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 50 cents.

HEALTH AND DISEASES OF WOMEN.

The origin and prevalence of the Diseases of Women; the druggery to which they are subjected, and a better way pointed out. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 20 cents.

THE TRUE HEALING ART.

The Principles and Practice of the Drug and Hygienic Systems contrasted, and the causes and correct treatment of disease explained. By Dr. TRALL. Price, 35 cents.

ANATOMICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PLATES,

Six in number, designed for Lecturers and Teachers. By Dr. TRALL. Price, \$20. (Not mailable.)

TWO NEW MEDICAL CHARTS,

So arranged as to present to the eye at a glance the fundamental problems of all the medical systems, and the distinctive principles in the philosophy and practice of the Hygienic System. Price, \$12. (Not mailable.)

OUR LATEST PUBLICATIONS:

SEXUAL PHYSIOLOGY—Numerous Illustrations.

A new and elaborate work, discussing in its length and breadth the whole subject of Sexual Physiology; together with an elaborate discussion on the Law of Sex, a New Theory of Population, Regulation of Offspring, Law of Intercourse, Hereditary Transmission, etc. etc. Eighty fine cuts. By R. T. TRALL, M. D. 12mo. Handsomely bound. Price, by mail, \$2. *Just published.*

ALCOHOLIC MEDICATION.

An Essay prepared for the Temperance Convention held at Saratoga in the summer of 1865. By R. T. TRALL, M. D. This is the best discussion on the question of Alcoholic Medication which has yet appeared. Price, 30 cents. *Just published.*

WOMAN'S DRESS—Finely Illustrated

With numerous Engravings, showing how Woman's Clothing can be made both beautiful, healthful and comfortable. In her Preface the authoress says: "I send this book forth trusting the truths it contains may be like seed sown on good ground, springing up and bringing forth fruit an hundred fold to bless and benefit mankind. 30 cents.

THE TURKISH BATH.

Its history and philosophy. By ERASMUS WILSON. With Notes and an Appendix by M. L. HOLBROOK, M. D. Illustrated. By mail, 25 cents.

THE NEW HYGIENIC COOK BOOK.

This work contains the latest recipes in use at the New York Institute, with many valuable recipes for canning and preserving fruit, laundry recipes, etc. Price, 30 cents.

RATHE'S MANUAL OF GYMNASTICS—Illustrated.

For Instruction in Classes and Private use. By W. L. RATHE. By mail, 40 cents.